

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cameron.

Drawings

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

New Claims

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1-2 and has added new claims 3-5 to this application. It is believed that the new claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and define subject matter that is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

The new claims are directed toward a telescopic rod assembly for a screen (10) comprising: a telescopic rod (40); two support members (41), one of the two support members is located on each of two opposing ends of the telescopic rod; and at least one hook shaped limiting piece (42) protruding upwardly from a top of an outer periphery of one of the two support members, wherein the at least one hook shaped limiting piece restricts a sliding movement of a predetermined ring of the screen.

Other embodiments of the present invention include: wherein the at least one hook shaped limiting piece includes two hook shaped limiting pieces, one of the two hook shaped limiting pieces is located in each of the two support members; and each at least one hook shaped limiting piece is integrally made with one of the two support members.

The cited reference to Cameron teaches a finial (14, 16) having an outer periphery having an enlarged part (34), an annular groove (36), and an annular bead (38).

Cameron does not teach at least one hook shaped limiting piece (42) protruding upwardly from a top of an outer periphery of one of the two support members; the at least one hook shaped limiting piece includes two hook shaped limiting pieces, one of the two hook shaped limiting pieces is located in each of the two support members; nor does Cameron teach each at least one hook shaped limiting piece is integrally made with one of the two support members.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. Applicant submits that it is abundantly clear, as discussed above, that Cameron do not disclose each and every feature of Applicant's new claims and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Absent a specific showing of these features, Cameron cannot be said to anticipate any of Applicant's new claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

It is further submitted that Cameron does not disclose, or suggest any modification of the specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Thus, it is not believed that Cameron renders obvious any of Applicant's new claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2005

By:


Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707